THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIX FEBRUARY, 1946 No. 308

Editorial

THE hopes and plans of statesmen for the future of the nation take, as yet, too little account of the heavy fall in our population which is now inevitable, though its precise extent is of course uncertain and variously estimated. Quite apart from its effects on British power and industry and urbanism, it would be well to prepare for the conditions that will exist when we are a nation of people whose average age will be around sixty-five. Long before then, the Church will have to come to terms with the decline in the number of the clergy. So far as we know, exact statistics are not available to show what is the average age of the clergy now. But we have heard it said by individuals who have surveyed their own diocese or rural deanery that the average age is already between sixty and seventy. If this is so, it means that in about ten years' time the shortage of clergy will become precipitous.

What will the Church do about it? Unless the movement towards church union makes more rapid progress than at present seems probable, there seem to be three possible courses. First, men might be ordained on much easier terms, and the depleted ranks of the clergy thus filled up. But present policy is, rightly we believe, in favour of raising, not lowering, the standard; and even if the ranks of the clergy were filled up it is unlikely that there will be enough money available to support them. Secondly, an attempt might be made to keep the parochial system operating more or less on its present scale by making much fuller use of the ministry of lay people or by admitting men, who earned their living in other ways, to a permanent diaconate. Thirdly, many churches might be closed down and the clergy concentrated at strategic centres. In country districts, for example, the congregation from several villages could be collected by means of a parish omnibus, as is done already in some other countries.

A combination of the second and third policies may prove to be best. But the whole question will require very careful consideration, and it is time that parochial congregations throughout the country were being brought to see why some such policy will be inescapable and were resolving how to make the best of it. However much we may deplore it, the ideal of having a resident priest in every parish has ceased to be realizable. Nor will it be tolerable to disperse what priests there are one by one all over the country, each with an increasingly unmanageable combination of parishes. Few can imagine the isolation and loneliness of innumerable parish priests with dwindling congregations. In the reconstructed system an effort should be made to see that priests are sent to work two by two, and not one by one. There is profound and enduring wisdom in the gospel precept. See what Latham says about it in *Pastor Pastorum*:

A man by himself has many dangers. He may grow downcast, and a depressed condition is not favourable to the growth of Faith; or he may harp upon one idea, and having no one to criticize it and reduce it to its right proportion, it may overshadow his whole mind and degenerate into a craze. The solitary missionary might find danger also in success. If the cures he wrought excited admiration, he might be inclined to take some of the glory to himself: or he might be tempted to go beyond his commission to preach the Kingdom, and try to establish some notions of his own about Jesus as the Christ. The presence of his colleague would recall him to his true position and remind him that he was not about his own work but his Master's. . . . When two men go together not only does each represent to the other the purpose with which he is sent, but also each supports the other. When one is inclined to despond the other feels forced to take a hopeful tone and this does good to both. (Pp. 297 *f.*)

The Bishop and his Church

For as long as one can remember we have been warned against the evil of parochialism, we have been urged to cultivate a world vision, the emphasis has been upon the universal Church. That is a very proper emphasis, but the time has now come for a balancing emphasis upon the local church, which in common with everything local is in danger of being swallowed up in a vapid cosmopolitanism. To tell the truth, world citizenship is a dreary business. Thus having lost our sense of neighbourhood we, who are by nature small-scale creatures, succumb in a kind of self-defence to the disease of sectionalism. Having ceased to be citizens of Great Mudford, we become toddlers, mothers, youth,[1] and there are not wanting those to docket us into our appropriate welfare units. This sectionalism is rampant in modern society. "The rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate," may not have been good, but it was better than the rich man in his well-to-do suburb on the edge of the golf course and the poor man on his housing estate some miles away. There was a wisdom in accord with Nature in the older ideal of locality and the Church may hesitate before, in its feverish search for this great thing, "relevancy," it shapes itself into accord with the fashionable "pattern." It may well be that it will do better service to society by striving—and it will be against great odds—to maintain the local and mixed community which would seem to be part of the groundwork of society's health. The local church is, in fact, the Christian answer to much of the social sickness of to-day.

The New Testament treats the local church with far greater seriousness than has been accorded to it of late by the theorists of Christian organization. The church at Ephesus is "a household of God, which is a church of a living God, a pillar and bulwark of the truth."[2] What more could be said of it? The church at Corinth is "a shrine of God"; it is "a body of Christ."[3] The predilection of translators for the definite article has tended to conceal the fact that St Paul can use of local

[1] *Cf.* Pearse and Crocker, *The Peckham Experiment*, 215.
[2] 1 Tim. iii, 15. See Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, 172 *ff.*
[3] 1 Cor. iii, 16 and xii, 27. See Hort, *op. cit.*, 130, 145.

churches terms which later generations have reserved for describing the universal Church. Indeed, the documents of the apostolic age provide a far clearer picture of the local church and its essential importance than of any ordering of the official ministry. But when at length episcopacy begins to emerge it is the bishop in his church that we see. It is from "the church sojourning in Rome" that the Epistle of Clement is addressed to "the church sojourning in Corinth." It was in the successions, each local church with its line of bishops claiming to go back directly or indirectly to an apostle, that continuity was held to be guaranteed.[1] In the third century Cyprian, that great caller of synods of bishops,[2] recommends much freedom of discretion to the bishop in his own church.[3] The local church with its bishop remained an entity.

For the local church is, at least in theory, the diocese, not the parish.[4] It remained so in practice even when the bishop delegated the right to celebrate the eucharist to the presbyters, but this made possible developments which can hardly have been foreseen. The Africa of Cyprian was a land of small sees, as the greater part of Italy has remained. Elsewhere indeed larger dioceses were to be found, but these would seem to have been variations of or aberrations from the prevailing pattern rather than a separate type. That is to say that, in the West at least, they were still city units but with a larger countryside. They occurred where the secular system of a citizen empire was modified by other factors such as tribalism. For it is much simpler to say with Duchesne,[5] that where, for instance, such dioceses occurred in Gaul, they owed their extent to the correspondingly large extent of the secular unit rather than to seek with Canon Watson[6] for however indirect a Syrian model. This Syrian model is itself based upon a somewhat cryptic title by which Ignatius describes himself—Bishop of Syria. Does this represent more than a survival in Syria of that earlier stage when St Paul, directly or through such representatives as Timothy and Titus, exercised a general supervision?[7] The Asian churches to which Ignatius wrote—Ephesus, Smyrna, Magnesia, Tralles, and Philadelphia —had each its bishop. It is true that some three hundred and fifty years later Theodoret, whom one suspects of an episcopal megalomania that has not been uncommon in other periods, boasts of eight hundred churches in his diocese of Cyrus. This was presumably the kind of Eastern diocese in which it was found necessary to have numerous chorepiscopi,[8] a development which the Church in her wisdom disapproved and finally prohibited. But in any case do those

[1] *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, ed. Swete, 105 *ff.*

[2] *Cambridge Medieval History*, i. 164.

[3] *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, 240, 241.

[4] Actually the term "parish" was itself originally used to describe, not a subdivision, but the episcopal see. Thus, writing of the period 600-750, Miss Deanesly says, " 'The sacerdos and his parochia' meant almost always the bishop and his see": *A History of the Medieval Church*, 31.

[5] *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution*, 12.

[6] In *The Church of England*, ed. Matthews, 23 *ff.*

[7] For the late development of a diocesan system in Egypt see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 232.

[8] Smith and Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, 353.

who, arguing back from the Cyrus of Theodoret to the Syria of Ignatius, suggest that dioceses of this scale were primitive contend that there were already other eucharists than the bishops'? Or were a numerous faithful deprived of regular participation in the life of the Church? The answer is perhaps that, if and where large dioceses existed in primitive times, there were few Christians outside the city, so that for effective purposes the diocese was small. Here, too, it was close-knit, a local church in more than name.

Now it is possible that, had the Church grown strong in Roman Britain, a diocesan system might have developed with sees in cantonal capitals such as Silchester.[1] The four ancient Welsh dioceses preserved down to our own times the boundaries of a pre-Roman tribalism.[2] But in fact the Church did not become strong in Roman Britain, and in any case the barbarians here swept town life away. Thus when Christian missionaries came to England, it was the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms that they found, and these became the basis of the English diocesan system. In founding the see of Rochester in such proximity to Canterbury, and both of them in the kingdom of Kent, the Roman Augustine may have had in view the reproduction of the type of sees which he had known in Italy. If so, the exigencies of missionary strategy intervened. Dorchester and Lindisfarne, the latter close to the Bernician royal centre of Bamburgh, tell a tale, alike for the Roman and the Scottish missions, of kingdom-sees. These were missionary centres, the homes from which a mission staff went out and to which it returned. Here was still the episcopal familia.[3] But was this state of affairs peculiar to England? Is it not likely that large dioceses elsewhere represent the same stage of development? Such dioceses seem to be found for the most part in the missionary fringe. But it will hardly be maintained that their founders intended to create a type of diocese other than that which they had known. What in fact happened was that development stopped short.

Familiarity with the normal small diocese of the longer-christianized Mediterranean area had, it may reasonably be supposed, no inconsiderable influence on the efforts of Theodore to divide the unwieldy units which he found in England. It proved a troublesome business and, for all that he achieved, the medieval English bishop became the peripatetic prelate travelling between his manors and administering somewhat perfunctory open-air confirmation as he went. Even so, a thirteenth-century Bishop of Hereford who, Mr Baskerville tells us,[4] was seldom out of his diocese was forced to confess, "I know that large numbers of children have had to go without this sacrament but pressure of business has prevented me from giving it." In the seventeenth century Richard Baxter, who rather surprisingly set a high value upon confirmation, complained that "dioceses were so vast that a bishop could not perform this and other offices for a hundredth part of his flock."[5]

[1] *Cf.* Collingwood, *Roman Britain*, 48.
[2] O. M. Edwards, *Wales*, 17.
[3] *Cf.* Deanesly, *op. cit.*, 43.
[4] Barnard's *Companion to English History*, ed. H. W. C. Davis, 411.
[5] Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, 470.

In some cases it was one of his manors which in course of time became the bishop's principal abode rather than the cathedral city. Fulham or Farnham or Hartlebury he could call his own. Thus his separation from the capitular body that was the relic of his familia was more or less complete. Even before this he had become feudalized. With the possible exception of Durham, England could show nothing comparable to the prince bishops of the Continent, but here too the bishop grew into a magnate, a status which has even now not altogether forsaken him. By whatever name he may call his house, he is still associated in the public mind with palaces.

These twin developments—the large diocese and the episcopal grandee (though the latter has become but a memory)—have greatly modified the whole conception of episcopacy. The time is long past when the bishop normally, or even frequently, presided over the various orders of the Church in the offering of the eucharist.[1] The teaching chair in the apse, from which he exercised his prophetic ministry of the word,[1] has in England (and in some French cathedrals) become the pinnacled throne in the choir. No amount of approachability and cordiality can make him more than a nominal father in God to any but the denizens of diocesan committees. Archbishops may write first-rate Gifford Lectures in the train, but it is hardly surprising that there are fewer Lightfoots and Westcotts. The bishop has, like everything and everyone else, been speeded up since the days when he ambled on horseback in his gaiters.

But now, when it is clear that force of circumstances is going to compel us considerably to modify the ecclesiastical organization which we have inherited, may it not be worth considering a return to more primitive arrangements—not in any antiquarian spirit, but for theological and administrative reasons? The demand for more suffragan and assistant bishops betokens a somewhat anomalous state of affairs. For indeed it may be doubted whether those early fathers to whom we appeal would have recognized a bishop without a church as in the succession at all. There were, it is true, the chorepiscopi, but their history seems to be exceedingly obscure. It is even doubtful whether this was a new office in the third century or whether the chorepiscopus was originally an independent village bishop whom in course of time the town bishop brought into subordination.[2] The fact that chorepiscopi took part in councils of their own right—five of them subscribed the canons of Nicæa[3]—suggests the latter. But it seems clear that as chorepiscopi they were definitely not full episcopi and that they could not perform all the episcopal functions. Rather they were a kind of semi-episcopal rural deans and were thus not comparable to the suffragan and assistant bishops that we know. At any rate the Church was at some pains to preserve the tradition that a bishop must have a church, partly by the use of bishops *in partibus* as assistant bishops[4] and partly by the only less fictitious sees provided for suffragan

[1] Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 28 *ff.* [2] Bigg, *The Origins of Christianity*, 496.
[3] Riddle, *A Manual of Christian Antiquities*, 222.
[4] For chorepiscopi and bishops *in partibus* see Macdonald, "Episcopi Vagantes in Church History," in the *Church Quarterly Review* (January, 1940), 226.

bishops. But now even that has gone by the board in the Anglican Communion.

This is indeed no new problem. Henry VIII's ambitious plans for the creation of a large number of new sees from the resources of the monasteries and with monastic churches as their cathedrals was reduced to meagre proportions by the demands of rearmament.[1] The scheme for a new see of Newcastle, which was probably no more than a cover for Northumberland's cupidity, did not outlast his term of power.[2] Till the nineteenth century nothing was done to deal with inconveniences which by that time had been aggravated by the effects of the Industrial Revolution. Yet even to-day the provision of a new see seems to be a matter of no small difficulty, and that quite apart from the opposition of those who fear that more numerous bishops will cut less of a figure in the world. The creation of a new diocese is an expensive business—and why? Chiefly because it is supposed that there must be a large diocesan machinery such as was already in the fourth century tending to be interposed between the bishop and his people. That this evil is on the increase is partly due to the prevailing passion for organization. If Barchester has an organizer of pew-openers, so must every other self-respecting diocese. But it is also and more largely the result of our whole conception of a bishop and a diocese.

The diocese has in fact long ceased to be in any real sense the local church. We speak of the cathedral as the mother church of the diocese, but the brood is like that of the old woman who lived in a shoe. One result of this lack of diocesan intimacy has been the excessive parochialism which has been so generally deplored of late. The diocese has been something too distant, too majestic; the parish has collected the loyalty and affection. To-day—more especially, but by no means only, in towns—such narrowness issues in a congregationalism as convenient as it is insidious. The answer to this centrifugal tendency is a unit large enough to embrace variety but small enough to express the sense of neighbourhood. But in any case it becomes apparent that for effective working the larger regionalism which modern transport has brought into operation in other departments of life must affect the ecclesiastical sphere also. The self-contained village is no more. That is not to say that we should abandon locality as our basis, but it does mean that the whole regional organization of the Church needs reconsideration and reshaping. Indeed the adaptation of the parish system to the new conditions has already been the subject of a number of proposals.[3] These are most necessary, but concurrently the future of the diocesan system also demands our thought.[4]

What then should be the pattern? There should be no attempt at a cut-and-dried pattern. Let us like good theologians be suspicious of tidiness. It might, for instance, be said, "If you want small dioceses, what about the present rural deaneries?" That would be carrying the

[1] Baskerville, *English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries*, 170.
[2] Sturge, *Cuthbert Tunstall*, 294.
[3] *E.g.* in *Country Planning*, ed. Orwin, chapter x.
[4] A strong case was made out for smaller dioceses by Lord Hugh Cecil in the *Oxford Diocesan Magazine*, October, 1922.

thing to an extreme, yet there are some deaneries which might make excellent dioceses—I have in mind the sort of deanery which more or less coincides with a county borough.[1] For here (always excepting megalopolis) is a significant unit, and it is for significant units that we should seek, units which are more than mere geographical expressions. There is also an obvious convenience, where this is otherwise practicable, in the coincidence of ecclesiastical and local government boundaries. In the East in the middle of the fifth century it was assumed that civil and ecclesiastical organization would exactly correspond, and the 17th canon of the Council of Chalcedon lays down that, when a place is raised to the rank of city by imperial edict, that place has *ipso facto* a right to a bishop of its own.[2] Again, the dignity which will accrue to a see from its association with a place of secular importance is not to be despised. This motive is seen at work in the transference of a number of sees by William the Conqueror and Lanfranc. A thriving industrial or market town is nowadays to be preferred to some village of remote historical association. Nor should local patriotism—county loyalty and the like—be left out of account, but in this connexion it may be noted that Lincolnshire has three county councils and Sussex and Suffolk two each, where the Church has but one diocese. In the case of Suffolk there has been created that mouthful of a diocese, St Edmundsbury and Ipswich. Here the provision of two see towns was apparently due to a fear of offending local susceptibilities. Would it not be better to cease twisting our tongues and to give Bury St Edmunds and Ipswich each a bishop?

A multiplication of dioceses might involve an increase in the number of provinces, but that in itself would have advantages. Canterbury stands for much in the Anglican Communion but for little in the province of Canterbury—that is to say, there is nothing in the character, history, or geography of the provincial area to knit it into meaningfulness. In passing, might it not be better to free the Primate of some of his pastoral responsibilities by providing him with a token diocese—say, the city of Canterbury and its immediate environs—before having recourse to the ominously bureaucratic expedient of a "general staff"? York in a measure stands for the North and the province is less unwieldy, yet even so there was some truth in Vanbrugh's remark when he wrote from York, after a visit to the farther North in 1721: "Here you must know we are in the South."[3] There are in England regions which are psychologically meaningful. The West Country, the Midlands, East Anglia are more than names. What more fitting than that Bristol or Norwich, which Macaulay, writing of the seventeenth century, describes as "the capital of a large and fruitful province," should have their archbishops? Greater London seems to constitute a natural pro-

[1] I have no idea how things are worked in Croydon, which, owing to the fact that it was a favourite place of residence for the Archbishops of Canterbury, is still an "island" in Canterbury diocese. If, as I imagine, most of the episcopal functions are carried out by the Suffragan Bishop of Croydon, there is here perhaps the embryo of a diocese of this type.

[2] *Cambridge Medieval History*, i. 169.

[3] Sitwell, *British Architects and Craftsmen*, 102.

vincial unit. Long ago in the days of Mercian supremacy Lichfield achieved this status for a few years[1] and the Trent valley still stands for something in the heart of England. But some of these may be mere romantic notions. My point is that there is room for an increase of provinces,[2] each with its archbishop (but not that papistical novelty, an "archdiocese"!). Such a development of the provincial system might be made the means of somewhat decentralizing the legislature of the Church and thus enabling it to be representative to an extent which is impossible when the expense of not infrequent visits to London is involved in its membership. The archbishoprics would provide the positions of eminence which, so the champions of large dioceses are fond of telling us, are necessary if men of exceptional ability are to exercise due influence.

But our concern should be less that the bishop shall be influential than that he shall be enabled to be a pastor and a teacher. He is in less danger of losing face than of losing touch. Indeed it is the whole nature of episcopacy which is in debate. One may ask the question to which we are continually assuming that we know the answer[3]—What is a bishop? It is this question that I want to stress. For I would not have it seem that I am primarily interested in reorganization, nor would I appear to be recommending a slavish imitation of the primitive. That was a very different society from our own, governed indeed by urbanism, but by a healthier urbanism. The *urbs* was then urbane, so that the author of the Apocalypse writes quite naturally in terms of a heavenly city where we, had we not been provided with another model, should almost certainly have pictured a heavenly countryside. Nevertheless the centuries in which the city group was the typical Christian unit stamped upon the episcopate certain characteristics which we may be loth to see it lose—though, to tell the truth, it has already largely lost them. But now, when the Church again finds itself over against the world, they assume a special and revived importance. For it is unlikely that much worldly dignity will attach to the episcopal office in the future. Episcopal greatness will be wholly of the type of Irenæus and not in the least of Wolsey.

What then is the bishop? First, he is the father of a family, his diocese, and it is a family which should have no uncles on the premises. In other words, suffragan and assistant bishops should have families of their own, and this may provide a first basis of division. Wherever a diocese has proved too large for the episcopal duties to be carried out by one bishop, that diocese should normally[4] be divided. For here an important principle is involved—that a bishop must have a church. His authority in the local church, his church, derives from the uni-

[1] Oman, *England before the Norman Conquest*, 341, 385.

[2] The acceptance of candidates for ordination might well be a matter of provincial rather than diocesan decision. The need for extra-diocesan control in this has already been recognized in the recent Report on Training for the Ministry.

[3] *Cf.* Editorial in THEOLOGY, April, 1943, 76 *ff.*

[4] The position of a coadjutor bishop, appointed to assist a bishop of advanced years and having the right of succession, is somewhat different. This may be a very desirable procedure.

versal Church, but his position in the universal Church also derives from the fact that he stands for the local church. He should come to the councils of the Church, not merely as a bishop, but as the bishop of somewhere, the representative and father of a body of Christians. The somewhat mechanical theory of succession introduced by Augustine[1] has obscured this principle. Nothing could have been more unfortunate.

Secondly, he is a constitutional ruler. Thus the *Statuta ecclesiæ antiqua* declares that his decision is without force "nisi clericorum præsentia confirmetur,"[2] and Ambrosiaster can argue that the bishop is still but "primus inter presbyteros."[3] In the fourth and fifth centuries bishops in writing to presbyters continued to style themselves "fellow-presbyter."[4] The bishop should function not only in his church but with his church. Here again the triumph of the Augustinian theory has had an ill effect in giving the bishop an unwarranted independence of his church, and more especially of his college of presbyters. So another test emerges. A diocese should not be so large that the bishop cannot enter into real and regular consultation with his synod. The not infrequent complaints of episcopal aloofness are, in so far as they are justified, due not to lack of amiability on the part of bishops but to unmanageable dioceses. The bishop on his side, one dares to suggest, might profit by being brought to see the contemporary scene through a variety of not inexperienced eyes. Incidentally "bishops and clergy" is an unhappy substitute for "bishops and curates" in the Prayer-Book prayer, for bishops are not a separate genus apart from the other clergy. Are not our difficulties in recommending episcopacy to others in part due to the fact that we have ourselves forgotten the true nature of the historic episcopate?

Indeed this whole question of the relation between the bishop and his church is clearly of primary importance from the point of view of reunion. For the time being at least effort might be more profitably spent upon dispassionate research into it than upon discussions the protagonists of which on either side are apt to allow the zeal of championship to outrun the sobriety of evidence. There will, of course, be those who wish to brush all that aside, who will cry urgency, but they are probably doing a disservice to the cause which they seek to promote. For we continue—often, one suspects, needlessly—to talk at cross purposes. In this connexion Archbishop Ussher's scheme for synodical government has a special interest as an earlier and coherent attempt to amalgamate discordant church systems, and that on a sounder basis than mere expediency.[5] His contemporary, Bishop Bedell of Kilmore, made "a deep impression on the Presbyterians in Scotland" by calling himself "co-presbyter." Such ideas had no further chance with the politically intransigent episcopacy which returned from exile at the Restoration,[6] but now they may point to a more

[1] *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, 194, 196.
[2] Bannister, *The Cathedral Church of Hereford*, 118.
[3] *Cambridge Medieval History*, 156. [4] Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 230.
[5] Carr, *Life of Ussher*, 279 *ff.* I am indebted to the Rev. F. R. Bolton for this reference and for information about Ussher and Bedell.
[6] *Cf.* Henson, *The Church of England*, 120.

hopeful path than those which we have been following. In that case the first step for Anglicans will be to re-examine, not so much the theory, as the practical working, of episcopacy amongst ourselves. In thus seeking, as Anglicans should—and always with one eye on present needs—to recover a more primitive purity, may we not in due course be found to have evolved a polity more widely acceptable?[1] At the least, to take things in this order can hardly prove less fruitful than the courses which have brought us to the present impasse.

Thirdly, the bishop is the guardian and expounder of sound doctrine. This does not mean that he must be a professional theologian, but it is most desirable that persons distinguished by their thought and scholarship should find their way to the episcopate and that in doing so they should not become so burdened with other cares that only a herculean mind can keep abreast of knowledge and retain its freshness. There is room for sees of various types—for Hippo as well as for Carthage. The weight and repute of episcopal learning might be greatly increased by the provision of at least a few episcopal thrones which in these days of turmoil could have something of the nature of professorial chairs.

Fourthly (though this should have been put first), the bishop is the president of his people's worship. In his absence their eucharist suffers a certain incompleteness. Now certainly we cannot set out to reproduce conditions in which the bishop is everywhere the normal celebrant, yet it is much to be desired that he should be in a position to celebrate the eucharist from time to time, and that not too infrequently, in all the parishes of his diocese, that he may be a familiar figure to all the faithful at their eucharist. At present he is associated in most of their minds only with the rite of confirmation.[2] Here may be another criterion for the size of dioceses. Again, the cathedral should be within easily visitable distance of all. For the cathedral is the church of which all other churches in the diocese are chapelries. On the Continent its patronal festival is very properly observed in all of them, and in our own legal documents—at the institution of an incumbent, for instance—its rights are still reserved. The cathedral should have its station days, when representatives of all the orders, gathered together from the whole diocese, do the Church's eucharistic offering with its full quota of assistants—the local church fully assembled and in action. In passing—would not the archdeacon be better employed in presiding at this and at other times over deacons who were not all just birds of passage on the way to the priesthood, rather than

[1] The essays contained in *The Early History of the Church and Ministry* were written as a result of a somewhat similar suggestion made in 1910 by Canon J. M. Wilson of Worcester. What seems not to have been observed at the time is that these essays, while they provide a most impressive support for episcopacy, also reveal that modern Anglican episcopacy is in practice very different in many far from unimportant particulars from that primitive episcopacy to which appeal is made. And if we are going to appeal to antiquity, as we constantly do in arguing that episcopacy is something more than expedient, then to antiquity we must go and not seek to evade the issue by in the same breath talking about development.

[2] *Cf.* Phythian-Adams, *The Way of At-one-ment*, 120. I cannot feel content, as Dr Phythian-Adams appears to be, with so meagre a survival of the bishop's direct ministrations to his people.

in acting as an episcopal substitute in the affairs of the diocese, the rôle often proposed for him? But if a cathedral station day is to be at all a usual experience for ordinary churchpeople, the cathedral—its size and grandeur are of far less importance than the use to which it is put—must be within reach. In these days, sad to say, the committee-room table is more apt to be a point of diocesan assembly than the Table of the Lord.[1]

Such, I conceive, should be the lineaments of the bishop and his diocese—not an exhaustive portrait but enough to show the picture which I have in mind. For again I would stress that it is not with ecclesiastical map-making that I am here concerned, but rather with the nature of episcopacy and, most of all—to return to the point at which I began—with the character and importance of the local church. It is significant that a Congregationalist[2] should be found reminding us that for us the local church is the diocese, and surely the times are calling us to heed this reminder. For necessity may be treated as opportunity, and clearly we are going to be under necessity of considerable reshaping. In undertaking this may we not well glance back at that from which we have developed and from which, so I have been seeking to suggest, we have gone astray?[3]

Frank Bennett.

Neston-in-Wirral.

Bishop Wilberforce Centenary[4]

Ecclus. xxi, 7: He that is mighty in tongue is known afar off: But the man of understanding knoweth when he slippeth.

Phil. ii, 15: Among whom ye are seen as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life.

All human judgments of men are necessarily in a measure external and provisional. They are beset with difficulties arising from imperfect knowledge, defective or too abundant sympathy, comparison with standards not always quite fairly applicable, especially in reference to those in the past. How will you judge a man who belonged to a generation of a century ago? By his record of achievements lasting to our own day; by the estimates of his contemporaries; by his own estimates of those with whom he had to work; by the vision and insight which he seemed to show in dealing with his problems, which are often also our own; or by some combination of all these factors so far as they can be ascertained and established?

One hundred years ago next Thursday, on the 13th of December, 1845, there was enthroned in this cathedral church as Bishop of Oxford

[1] It will be obvious that much of this paragraph has been inspired by *The Shape of the Liturgy*, though I have no notion how far Dom Gregory Dix would agree with my contentions.

[2] Jenkins, *The Nature of Catholicity*, 106.

[3] Since I wrote this article the Editor has drawn my attention to a particularly interesting pamphlet written by Newman in 1835 in which he discusses the ill effects of the vast dioceses which then existed, together with the history of the diocesan system and of suffragan bishops: Newman, *The Restoration of Suffragan Bishops Recommended.*

[4] A sermon preached in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, on December 9, 1945.

a man forty years of age of whom it has been said, with somewhat more truth than is usual in such general statements, that he "revolutionized the idea of episcopacy throughout the whole English-speaking world". Samuel Wilberforce's predecessor, the mild and sagacious Richard Bagot, had managed to combine the offices of Bishop of Oxford and Dean of Canterbury and the care of eight sons and four daughters with a moderating influence in ecclesiastical controversies which won him the esteem of the Tractarians. Wilberforce's estimate was that "his conduct had more than any other secondary thing helped on our fearful troubles and divisions"—a harsh judgment, we may think, of a character in which in Dr Pusey's view "God's providence had been so wonderfully shown" for sixteen years. Of Pusey himself the new bishop had written: "I quite believe him to be a very holy man. I could sit at his feet. But then I see that he is, if I understand God's Word aright, most dark as to many parts of Christ's blessed Gospel. . . . I see that he has greatly helped, and is helping, to make a party of semi-Romanisers in the church, to lead some to Rome, to drive back from sound church views those amongst us who love Christ, for another half-century, and to make others grovel in low unworthy views of their Christian state, trembling always before an hard Master, thinking dirt willingly endured holiness, etc. Now there must be *some cause* why so good a man should fall into such fearful errors, and do such deep mischief, and that cause, I believe, is a great want of humility, veiling itself from his eyes under the appearance of entire abasement. I see it in all his writings and doings. His last letter about Newman I think deeply painful, utterly sophistical and false." It is a strange contrast with the respect and reverence with which Dr Pusey was regarded by very many both in this place and outside; and such language in the unrestrained freedom of private letters does not suggest a very promising beginning for a new episcopate. Yet singular tributes were paid to Wilberforce's work and character after his sudden death as Bishop of Winchester twenty-eight years later, and notably by Mr Gladstone when he said: "No spot in this land, I may say, can be found—certainly none where there is any considerable concentration of the people—in which that extraordinary influence of his has not been brought to bear, and there was not one in which, when he visited it, he did not seem to spend his entire self on the purpose which he had before him, as though nothing had come before it in his life, and nothing was to come after it. . . . I say that he was the bishop, not of a particular church, not of a particular diocese, but of the nation to which he belonged. I say that his heart beat high and strong to everything which could stir the feelings or command the understanding of an Englishman. I say that his action went far and wide among us in a degree that has never been known before." With every allowance for the partiality of a friend and the rhetorical expansiveness of a great orator, that is a remarkable testimony; and the student of the period will find many confirmations of its justice, even though subsequent generations have been somewhat more critical both of the characteristics of Wilberforce's career and of its consequences in the life of the Church.

When Samuel Wilberforce became Bishop of Oxford he had already achieved a considerable reputation. As an Oriel undergraduate he had done well in the schools, and as a notable speaker as well as an officer of what became the Union Society he had shown that he was not afraid of espousing unpopular causes. As a country rector he had been a great reconciler of differences. As Archdeacon of Surrey and Canon of Winchester and at the same time Rector of Alverstoke and chaplain to the Prince Consort he had entered upon a course of diversified activities which would have taxed the energies of a strong man. Yet before he became bishop he had already achieved also a Life of his famous father, a history of the American Church, and a set of Bampton lectures. Men and women spoke of the charm, power, beauty, practicalness and golden sweetness of his sermons and speeches; and these are not the judgments of gushing admirers but of shrewd and competent hearers. And even if a *Guardian* reviewer was to speak of "the slightly manneristic torrent of eloquence with which Bishop Wilberforce clothes an argument or an exhortation" there is at least recognition as well as criticism. For twenty-four years he was Bishop of Oxford, for four years Bishop of Winchester. That he would have desired higher promotion is abundantly shown by his diary; but at any rate such ambitions were mostly, if not at most, for greater opportunity of service, even though at times accompanied by rather painful reflexions on the characteristics and capacity of his ecclesiastical superiors and his brother bishops. And certainly he deserves lasting remembrance in the diocese of Oxford, where his greatest work was done. In that curious and unwieldy agglomeration of three counties—Oxon and Berks and Bucks—over which Samuel Wilberforce was the first to rule as bishop, his activities were as manifold as they were incessant, yet time was also found for other exertions in a still wider field, and in both the results remain for judgment. The colleges at Cuddesdon for ordination candidates and at Culham for schoolmasters, the sisterhoods at Wantage and at Clewer, the establishment of diocesan missions, and of retreats for clergy, the development of diocesan conferences, Church Congresses, the Lambeth Conference, the restoration of Convocation to activity, the furtherance of the work of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, and the extension of the missionary episcopate in heathen lands—all these owed much, and some, under God, almost everything, to his guidance and inspiring enthusiasm and tireless energy. And beyond all question not only in the three counties and in South London but in many other parts of England he was better known and had a greater attraction for working men than any other ecclesiastic of his time. And that attraction was exercised and won not by claptrap and mere rhetoric, not by being "Court chaplain to King Demos," but by straight speaking combined with wit and humour and real sympathy, and above all and under all and through all a passionate religious earnestness.

Bishop Wilberforce's own life had in it great personal sorrows both through bereavement and through the desertion of the Church of their baptism by so many who were very near to him. The effect of the former was seen in wonderful sympathy with others stricken by the

death of those they loved; the effect of the latter in bitter and most uncharitable invectives against the Church of Rome or jibes, with perhaps somewhat greater justification, at what he called "the little apish Romanism of the Ritualists." His claim that his own theology was that of Hooker and of Andrewes is possibly open to dispute, and his natural temper was clearly less tolerant than he deemed it to be. His judgment of men not cast in the same mould was hard and at times certainly unjust. He could write to Liddon, who was vice-principal of Cuddesdon, in terms of deep affection, and couple in a letter to a friend an expression of conviction that Liddon was entirely honest with another that in the matter of a particular aspect of doctrinal teaching he is not, so to speak, trustworthy. If he is correctly reported Bishop Wilberforce sometimes made claims for the episcopal office which history does not warrant; and as a contemporary—himself a very active bishop—once wrote, "You have introduced such a system into the episcopate that one has time for nothing." He was not at his best in the handling of controversy, and some of his interventions resulted in dialectical triumphs which it would have been better, one may venture to think, for a bishop not to win—a conclusion of which his diary shows that he was not himself always unconscious.

The three volumes of Wilberforce's biography, like the two volumes of the Life of his brother-in-law Cardinal Manning, have been charged with indiscretion. But they bear reading again and again as records of the strength and weakness of a great personality in the English life of his day; and it is clear beyond doubt that, ambitious as he was, concern for personal interests never stood in the way of courses of action which in his conscience he believed to be right, whatever later ages may think of his policy. There is one aspect of his episcopal work to which attention may be called in conclusion. It is perhaps the least emphasized in popular accounts but concerned with the gravest and most difficult of all a bishop's responsibilities—namely, that indicated in the statement of one of his clergy that "the most telling part of the late Bishop's work was to be found in his confirmations and ordinations." Into what had tended to become, and in many cases had become, mechanical and perfunctory (and certainly the stories which some of the older among us have inherited from that past generation and from the lips of those who had known them from personal experience are so astonishing as to be almost incredible but for that direct testimony) Wilberforce was enabled, under God, not only to introduce new organization and training, but also to show that he realized to the full the importance of the God-given opportunity which each such occasion offered. Its possible results extend far beyond the present to affect the lives of thousands whom the bishop will never see but whom those with whom he is dealing may influence in homes and parishes where it may be theirs to fulfil Wilberforce's own father's ambition for his sons, that they might "shine as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life."

Claude Jenkins.

The Promises of Haggai and the Yea of Christ

Much has recently been written on the subject of the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New. It is possible and perhaps useful to distinguish three forms or levels of fulfilment:

First, those passages in which Christ Himself, by word or act, claims that the Scriptures bear witness of Him. An example of this level is the fulfilment of Zech. ix, 9 in Mark xi, 1-10.

Secondly, those passages in which the New Testament writers see in Christ or in His Church the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. These passages may be subdivided into (*a*) those in which the writer explicitly states the fulfilment, as when John says: "These things said Isaiah, because he saw his glory; and he spake of him" (xii, 41); and (*b*) those in which the fulfilment is not stated explicitly but in an allusive way, as when Mark says that John the Baptist "was clothed with camel's hair, and had a leathern girdle about his loins" (i, 6; *cf.* 2 Kings i, 8).

Thirdly, instances of fulfilment of which the New Testament writers do not themselves speak, which are seen by the reader of the Bible.

Before giving an example of this third level of fulfilment, two comments may be made on these distinctions.

First, some might deny that there is any difference between the first and second groups of passages, holding that the word or act of Christ comes to us only through the medium of a New Testament writer and that therefore all passages in the first group are included in the second. But in justification of the distinction we have made it may be said that though in no particular case can we be certain that the fulfilment was in the mind of the historical Christ, yet it seems very probable that there were some such cases, and that there is a double tradition that He did Himself claim to fulfil the Scriptures (Luke xxiv, 27, 45-47; John v, 39).

Secondly, it should be noted that there is an essential difference between the study of the first and second groups and the study of the third. In the former, the student is ordering and making explicit an interpretation which is already there in Scripture, having scriptural authority; in the latter, he is drawing conclusions from what is implied in Scripture, using a Scriptural method for the fuller understanding of Christ. The former is descriptive; the latter is creative. But if the rule of the method is observed, both may be equally critical.

For the study of the third level of fulfilment is full of danger; it is open to all the excesses of the mystical interpretation of the Old Testament, which is a perilous method of reading the Word of God, because, lacking the directive guidance of Christ and the inspired writers (which he has when he studies the first and second groups), the student is at the mercy of his own subjectivity and fancy. Although there is this danger there is no reason why the method used by the canonical writers, with the authority of Christ, should not be continued. And its validity seems to follow logically and necessarily if we believe in the unity of the Word of God and in some form of divine authorship of Holy Scripture.

The rule which must be observed in reading the Old Testament in

order to understand Christ is that the historical, or bodily, sense of the writer must always be the starting-point. What the writer teaches about Christ must not be forced into his words but drawn out from them. Therefore the discipline of historical and philological criticism is always necessary, as a check against subjectivity and fancy.

An example of the third type of study of the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New is that of the promises of Haggai. This prophecy is particularly suited to such treatment, since it is only once quoted or alluded to in the New Testament (ii, 6): the shaking of the heaven and the earth, in Heb. xii, 26. The only other marginal reference to the New Testament in the Revised Version is at ii, 9, "In this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts," to Eph. ii, 14, "He is our peace," and it could not reasonably be argued that Paul had this sentence of Haggai in mind when he wrote; nor does the R.V. marginal reference at Eph. ii, 14 refer back to Haggai ii, 9.

The prophet Haggai addressed the people in Jerusalem ("the remnant of the people") in the year 520, over sixty years after the destruction of the city and deportation of the leading citizens. He drew their attention to the curse or judgment of God under which they were living, which showed itself in the poor harvests, the drought, and the blight (i, 9-11; ii, 15-19). He attributed this to their neglect of the Lord's house, which was still lying waste because the people said that the time had not come to rebuild it, though they had looked to their own houses (i, 2, 4, 9). Therefore, when the work has been begun, and the foundation of the Lord's temple laid, he declares that henceforth the Lord will bless the people (ii, 15-19).

Chapter ii, 10-14, concerning the uncleanness of the nation, their work and their offerings, is a commentator's crux, because it is not easy to see how it fits in with the rest of the prophecy or with the historical situation. Was the uncleanness caused through contact with the Samaritans or with the wasted temple? Waiving a final decision on this question, and assuming that there is no break between verses 14 and 15, it follows that the prophet declares that the uncleanness, which is the cause of the scarcity, however it was itself caused, will be wiped out by the laying of the foundation of the temple; and that good crops will follow in future.

Haggai had to face the despondency of those who remembered the temple which the Babylonians had destroyed. To them he speaks of future glory, which will follow a great cosmic "shaking"; the wealth of all nations will come to the Lord's house, its glory shall be greater than before, and there God will give peace (ii, 1-9).

The final prophecy, to Zerubbabel alone, also speaks of the "shaking" of the world and of the destruction of the power of the nations; and promises Zerubbabel, the servant and chosen of the Lord, that he will become "as a signet"—that is, that to him will be restored the royal privileges of his grandfather, Jehoiachin, and that he will become the vicegerent of God (Jer. xxii, 24; Gen. xli, 42) (ii, 20-23).

The principal theme of the prophecy is therefore the judgment which has followed the neglect of the Lord's house and the removal of the judgment through its rebuilding. So Paul shows how the un-

godliness and unrighteousness of men have called forth the revealing of the wrath of God from heaven (Rom. i, 18-32). But those who have been justified by the blood of Christ shall be saved from the wrath (Rom. v, 9); He "delivereth us from the wrath to come" (1 Thess. i, 10). The saving power of the old temple is fulfilled in the saving power of Christ.

For He is the new temple of God, made without hands. This is stated in accordance with the irony of chapters xiv and xv of Mark. All the accusations and taunts are true: He is the "King of the Jews" (xv, 2, 9, 12, 16-20, 26, 32); He is "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed" (xiv, 61; xv, 32) and the Son of God (xv, 39); He is able to save Himself and come down from the cross (xv, 30-32); and He is also destroying the old temple, and, by His resurrection, He will build another (xiv, 58; xv, 29). The new temple is the body of Christ (John ii, 18-22), not only the resurrection body, but also the mystical body, the Church: "For we are the temple of the living God" (2 Cor. vi, 16; *cf.* Eph. ii, 21; 1 Pet. ii, 5; Rev. iii, 12). Thus Christ and His Church fulfil Haggai's promise of the redemptive power of the house of the Lord; for through them and in them, as in the new temple, there is no more curse (Rev. xxii, 3).

Moreover, Christ is the foundation-stone (1 Cor. iii, 11, as He is also the corner-stone of Ps. cxviii, 22 and Isa. xxviii, 16; *cf.* Mark xii, 10; Acts iv, 11; 1 Pet. ii, 4-8); thus fulfilling Haggai's promise that the curse would be removed "since the day that the foundation of the Lord's temple was laid" (ii, 18).

The promise of the blessing to follow the laying of the foundation-stone in the prophecy came after the passage on the uncleanness of the nation. And Christ, the foundation-stone, makes atonement for the sin of the world and by His own blood obtains eternal redemption (Heb. ix, 12; *cf.* the whole argument of vii-x).

In reply to the despair of the older Jews, Haggai foretold a cosmic "shaking," and a greater glory for the new temple, into which the wealth of all nations would come, and where God would give peace. So Matthew records earthquakes at the crucifixion and at the resurrection (xxvii, 51, 54 and xxviii, 2); but because the fulness of Christ's work is still in some respects in the future, one of the signs of the beginning of travail before the end comes is that "there shall be earthquakes in divers places" (Mark xiii, 8); and "there was a great earthquake" at the opening of the sixth seal in the seer's vision (Rev. vi, 12).

"And the desirable things of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts" (ii, 7). The desirable things are the riches of all nations; *cf.* ii, 8, "The silver is mine, and the gold is mine." As with the "shaking," so with the wealth, the fulfilment in Christ is both present and future. For the gentile Magi offer their treasure (Matt. ii, 11); and the "kings of the earth do bring their glory" into the heavenly city (Rev. xxi, 24).

"And in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts" (ii, 9*b*). Yes, for Christ is our peace, and He comes preaching peace (Eph. ii, 14, 17; *cf.* also Luke ii, 14; Acts x, 36; Rom. v, 1; Col. i, 20, iii, 15).

Haggai's reply to the older Jews is fulfilled also in a more general

way by Christ. The house of the Lord was at that time, in their eyes, as nothing (ii, 3); but the latter glory of the house should be greater than the former (ii, 9). Christ at His first coming was, in the eyes of men, suffering and humiliated, fulfilling also the servant of Isaiah; but they would see "the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven" (Mark xiv, 62; *cf.* also Matt. xvi, 27; xxiv, 30; Rev. i, 7). The pattern of humiliation and glory in the temple is reproduced in the Messiah, for it is the pattern of the Messianic life.

The private prophecy to Zerubbabel, the governor of Judah, was similar to that given to the older Jews: the "shaking" of the earth and heavens, and the destruction of the power of the nations. One sentence from the Magnificat may be added to what has been already noticed of its fulfilment: "He hath put down princes from their thrones" (Luke i, 52). Zerubbabel is called "my servant"; he is told, "I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts"; he is promised, "I will take thee . . . and will make thee as a signet" (ii, 23). This too is fulfilled. For Christ is the servant and chosen one, of whom Isaiah also had spoken (Matt. xii, 18; Isa. xlii, 1); He takes the form of a servant (Phil. ii, 7); and though He is not called the signet of God in the New Testament, John says that the Father has sealed Him (vi, 27); moreover, by applying to Him the titles of Christ and Son of David, all that was contained in the idea of a signet of God is fulfilled: possessor of the vicegerency of God; successor of the Davidic Kings.

No attention has been paid to Jesus the son of Jehozadak, the high priest, and to his fulfilment in Jesus the Son of God, the great high priest (Heb. iv, 14). This may require some comment. The author of Acts (vii, 45) and the writer to the Hebrews (iv, 8), and perhaps other New Testament writers, see the fulfilment of Jesus son of Nun in Jesus Christ. But the parallelism of the work of the two latter called "Jesus" is deeper than, and independent of, their common name, though the common name may have suggested the typology in the first place. In the case of Jesus, son of Jehozadak, apart from the fulfilment of the high priesthood, there is no promise in Haggai which Jesus the Son of God fulfils.

If this method of reading an Old Testament prophecy be allowed, and if the general outline of the conclusions reached through applying it to the prophecy of Haggai be accepted, it may be possible to overcome the difficulty, which many commentators have noticed, of attaching "religious value" to this book of Holy Scripture.

J. C. Fenton.
Hindley.

BOOK REVIEWS

What is Christian Civilization? By John Baillie. Oxford University Press. 3s. 6d.

In the Riddell Memorial Lectures before the University of Durham Prof. John Baillie discusses the question: What is Christian civilization? He asks "in what sense any possible civilization can be said to

be Christian," and concludes that "so far as our civilization is still Christian, it is this principally in respect of the fact that its *conscience* is still recognizably Christian, that we judge other men and nations, and to a less extent avow ourselves to be judged, by norms of conduct which Christianity introduced into the world"; but he adds, "even the most Christianized of earthly civilizations is seen by the Christian faith to fall under the ultimate judgment of God."

After a reminder of the entirely new problem which confronted the earliest Christians, and of the change which came with Constantine, Prof. Baillie observes that with Charlemagne, "if anywhere, we have the first clear concept of a Christian civilization." And when "compulsory Christianity finally came to an end" towards the end of the eighteenth century there developed "a situation new in the history of mankind." Prof. Baillie holds that the causes of our present condition involve not only the "disturbance of the traditional intellectual outlook," but also the "simultaneous disturbance of the traditional social life of the community." Can such a society be called Christian, or must the various protesting minorities and sects be allowed to retain the name for themselves? Prof. Baillie thinks it is wrong to ignore "the Christianity which pervades the life of the community" and to define Christianity solely in terms of personal decision or a narrowly conceived evangelism; and he finds himself in general agreement with Maritain and T. S. Eliot.

Prof. Baillie has packed an enormous amount into sixty pages and perhaps it would be ungracious to ask for more. But I am still not clear whether the word "Christian" is properly used without any reference to the recognition of atonement and with only ethical content; this, I think, is the sense in which Prof. Baillie is using it in this discussion, though he does not, of course, suggest that this sense of the word is his own. I had hoped, for example, for further examination of the actual current uses of the word "Christian" and for some explanation of the verb "Christianize." But though there is not quite all that we might ask for, Prof. Baillie has once again put us all in his debt by these lectures. In reviewing *The Thrill of Tradition* by James Moffatt in the *J.T.S.* Dr Mozley said: "Perhaps it has always been typical of the Scottish religious scholar so to teach as to edify." Of Prof. Baillie this is as true in these pages as it is in his other books.

H. C. L. Heywood.

Southwell.

The Consecration of Matthew Parker. By J. C. Whitebrook. Mowbray. 8s. 6d.

Mr Whitebrook has presented us with an ingenious thesis, but the reader may be justified in wondering if the argument might not have emerged more clearly if some of the picturesque but often irrelevant detail were omitted. Shorn of its trappings, the author's argument is, briefly, that Parker was consecrated, not, as is commonly held, by Barlow, Coverdale, Hodgkins and Scory on December 17, 1559, but by Kitchin (the more usual spelling of the name) on or about October 29. He dismisses the ceremony of December 17 as, possibly,

the installation of Parker as Protestant Archbishop, after his earlier consecration by a rite which was an adaptation of the Sarum pontifical. This is an interesting conjecture and Mr Whitebrook has certainly left no stone unturned in his zeal for proving it; but he will surely be met by champions of the "orthodox" narrative who can produce arguments just as powerful in favour of December 17 as he does for the earlier date. It is difficult to find credence for quite so much forgery as his argument assumes.

A good deal of Mr Whitebrook's evidence rests upon Parker's description of himself, and upon allusions to him, as "archbishop" when he was really only archbishop-elect. It is certainly unusual that Parker in letters patent before his consecration is described as archbishop without any qualification, but it may be conjectured that, in the somewhat exceptional circumstances, his pontifical years may have been dated from the first royal assent, especially as parliamentary legislation at the time showed a distinct disposition to ignore the importance of consecration in the status of a bishop. Another question which naturally occurs to the reader is one based on common-sense—why, if Parker was anxious to be recognized as a bishop of the Catholic Church, was the alleged consecration by Kitchin kept so dark, and why does no positive proof of it remain?

There is no room here to examine Mr Whitebrook's thesis in detail, but perhaps it will not be considered over-captious to point out one or two cases in which he jumps to startlingly incorrect conclusions by not giving enough consideration to the facts. On p. 96 the registrar's entry of Lambeth Palace on various occasions as in the diocese of Winchester is called a "ridiculous mistake"; but it is not a mistake, for the parish of Lambeth was in the diocese of Winchester and was not a peculiar of the Archbishop. On p. 97 the author supposes that a suffragan bishopric of Penarth was at one time contemplated; but no such title is mentioned in the Act of 26 Henry VIII, c. 14, which does mention Penrith twice over as Penreth and Pereth, neither version being a possible form of Penarth. These are typical inaccuracies.

The last chapter in the book does nothing to enhance its value. Is the account of Kitchin's legendary trip into Gloucestershire really of any importance? The paragraph dealing with the etymology of Tatha or St Tathans, the position of which a glance at a map will decide more correctly than Mr Whitebrook's description, contains more than one rash statement. At least one well-known gazetteer mentions the parish (which incidentally has now reached fame as the site of one of the largest airfields in Wales), and, moreover, it is merely fanciful to attribute the dedication to St Athanasius. Surely St Tathan, a supposed nephew of St Illtyd who gave his name to the neighbouring Llantwit Major, or the female St Tatha or St Teath, is much more likely. The last few pages of the book degenerate to mere silliness. When so many minor points can be discredited, is it likely that the main argument can bear too close inspection?

Beatrice M. Jalland.

Exeter.

Martin Luther: Hitler's Cause or Cure? In reply to Peter F. Wiener. By Gordon Rupp. Lutterworth Press. 3s. 6d.

The English are traditionally hospitable to refugees and exiles, but they have a quiet preference for those who do not attempt to ingratiate themselves by reviling the country of their origin, its people, its religion, or its culture. Mr Peter Wiener's *Martin Luther: Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor* ("Win the Peace" pamphlet No. 3, Hutchinson, 2s. 6d.), published in May, 1945, and dedicated "in respect, gratitude, and friendship" to Lord Vansittart, was an exemplarily regrettable production. It is typical that Mr Wiener should have expected to discredit Pastor Niemoeller with the English public by pointing out that when war broke out in 1939 he wrote to Hitler from his concentration camp to offer to fight for his country (*op. cit.*, p. 78). It is also of some interest that, having been for four years a modern languages master at Rugby, Mr Wiener should, on being invalided out of the Royal Fusiliers, have elected to widen his experience of English secondary education by taking a post at—Stowe! (*ibid.*, p. 7). Perhaps these two facts are as much as anyone needs to know about Mr Wiener, except that he himself was educated at a Lutheran school in Berlin.

But such is the state of Reformation studies in this country that it has hitherto been possible for anyone to say almost anything he pleases about Martin Luther, especially if it be abusive, without fear of contradiction. Mr Wiener tells us that he was encouraged to publish his nauseating little book by Lord Vansittart, Dean Inge, and Prof. Oscar Levy; and in fact it had favourable reviews not only from the editor of the *New Statesman* (which was perhaps to be expected), but also from the Dean of St Paul's (which was not). That simply illustrates the point that one can repeat almost any old calumny about Luther and get away with it. In his *Three Reformers*, M. Maritain, that somewhat overrated publicist, did in fact get away with a very effective, if not at all reliable, series of Luther portraits, which even Denifle had hesitated to produce in evidence, and which Grisar himself had scorned to use. M. Funck Brentano also got away with a biography of Luther which Mr Wiener describes as "famous," but which in truth is notable chiefly for its impudent disregard of the canons of modern historical scholarship. True, a very proper protest against the "Catholic Caricature" of Luther was registered by Mr Rupp in Theology (October, 1942), but it attracted little attention from the teaching profession or from the general public.

What is really needed now is that some publisher should commission somebody to translate Karl Holl (of whom Mr Wiener does not seem ever to have heard). When that is done, Holl will revolutionize the teaching of the history of the Continental Reformation in this country, as he did in Germany. But for the meanwhile Mr Rupp has certainly given us something to be getting on with in this informing and exhilarating little book. As a reply to Mr Wiener, it is devastating. It is also exceedingly amusing. Regarded as a controversialist, Mr Rupp has the merits and the limitations of youth: he is good-humoured and high-spirited; his method is less reminiscent of the poisoned rapier than of a puppy playing with a rat. But he knows the meaning

of historical scholarship, and he knows his stuff. Particularly valuable to the professional historian is the chapter on Luther and the Peasants' War; while the brisk debunking of M. Maritain's select portrait-gallery, and the appendix on the Art of Select Quotation (with much more to the same effect *passim* in the preceding chapters), afford serviceable illustrations to anyone who is trying to teach the technique of historical research. No scholar in this country has done more than Mr Rupp to demolish the *real* "Luther Legend"; and the ninety-five pages of his thesis are of such high cautionary value that Anglo-Catholic clergymen in particular will find it advisable to consult them carefully before the next occasion on which they lay down the law in public about what "heretical Luther" believed or said or did.* In short, this little book is so good and so useful that one can only hope that it will have the circulation it deserves.

Charles Smyth.

Corpus Christi College,
Cambridge.

The Fourfold Vision. A Study of the Relations of Science and Religion. By F. Sherwood Taylor. Chapman and Hall. 6s.

Books about the relation between religion and science too often suffer from being written either by theologians whose knowledge of science is inadequate or by scientists who are imperfect in their understanding of the Christian Faith. It is largely because of his competence in both spheres that this book by the Curator of the Museum of the History of Science at Oxford should be of real and permanent value. The arrangement of his discussion is admirable. He begins by defining the functions and methods of science and religion: the scientist "seeks, for himself and for others, the completest possible presentment of the external perceptible world with the least possible expenditure of thought," while, as St Thomas says, "the word religion means that ordering to God to which God orders man." The subsequent treatment falls into two parts. The former, which is mainly defensive, deals with the realm in which religion and science come into contact. Here the possibility of conflict is twofold. In the first place, science may seem to contradict certain propositions which form part of the Creed, but far more serious is the fact that science seems at first glance to rule out the religious view completely by setting up a totally incompatible materialistic system of the world. These objections are countered in turn by a penetrating exposition of the nature of scientific law (in which the discussion of parthenogenesis is specially remarkable) and of the limitations of the scientific method. In the latter part of the book a positive approach is developed. It is shown that, while science as such is by its nature incapable of either proving or disproving the existence of God, it nevertheless directs attention to certain metaphysical considerations which point to God as the Creator of the world. This being done, the attempt is made to relate science to the other

---

* *Note.*—Mr. Rupp has since disposed of the notorious "Christi adulter" passage from the Table Talk (duly exhumed by Mr. Wiener, and greeted with corybantic acclamations from the Catholic underworld, where it appears to have been previously unknown) in a letter to the *Spectator*, Dec. 28, 1945.

forms of human awareness, and it is argued that a "fourfold vision" is necessary (the phrase is William Blake's) in order to comprehend the totality of human experience. From a mere perception of the surface of nature (like that of Wordsworth's Peter Bell) man can rise, first to an apprehension of the order of nature in science, then to the perception and integration of beauty in art, and finally to the apprehension of the unity of the world in relation to God. It is strikingly observed that "before the separation of science and the acceptance of it as the sole valid way of apprehending nature, the vision of God in nature seems to have been the normal way of viewing the world, nor could it have been remarked as an exceptional experience." Science is an element in wisdom, but wisdom is more than science: "God us keep From single vision and Newton's sleep." In the vision of God alone, seen obscurely here but face to face hereafter, can the true significance of terrestrial science be discerned: *Qui scientem cuncta sciunt, quid nescire nequeunt.*

Only one point seems to call for criticism. In the exposition of the arguments for the existence of God it is not sufficiently emphasized (though it is implied) that the Causeless Cause to which they lead is not a first cause in the finite order of causality, but a transcendent cause outside it; it is important to rule out the perennial tendency of natural religion towards pantheism. This is, however, a small point, to which the author's own plea that he is not writing in the language of technical metaphysics may be held to be a sufficient reply. His book is thoroughly to be recommended, both as a fine piece of theistic apologetic and as an inspiring expression of religious faith.

E. L. Mascall.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

The Christian Religion. A Brief Account. By Henry Balmforth. National Society and S.P.C.K. 4s.

The Christian Way. By Frederic Greeves. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

This pair of books will meet a welcome wherever clergy and teachers are on the lookout for fresh ways of presenting old truths both to pupils and to inquirers. Much of what they contain has been written or said before. Doubtless the authors would be amongst the first to admit that acknowledgments and footnotes can give but a small idea of their debt to present-day and previous writers. But their compactness is new. They are interesting specimens of a class of literature which the reading public compels Christian writers to adopt. Each is a Christian "digest."

There is a significant agreement between the two books: both claim to give an account of the same subject, and both wish to stress how theological it is. "We are not all theologians," writes Canon Balmforth, "but . . . theology is necessary; for it provides the bones and sinews for the faith of the wayfaring Christian." With the simile and the sentiment Mr Greeves agrees. But beyond that distinctions appear. Canon Balmforth writes as an Anglican, Mr Greeves is a Methodist, and when the books are read together they provide comparisons. The

former reproduces in front of his opening chapter "the Christian Creed (commonly called the Apostles' Creed)," plans his exposition on its articles, and states their implications as signposts along the Churchman's road; the latter begins each chapter with a text, arranges "our sources of information" in the order of: "1. The Bible. 2. Recorded Christian tradition outside the Bible. 3. Contemporary Christians," and balances allusions to Anglican and other theologians with a prominent quotation from *The Nature of the Christian Church, according to the teaching of the Methodists*. Again, the former makes it a chief aim to demonstrate the reasonableness of the Christian religion. He is anxious to show that this characteristic spreads beyond the region of what has been called Natural or Rational Theology and colours also the doctrines of Revealed Theology. In two important chapters—on "the problem of man" and "the divine answer"—he draws a conclusion from the tragic tale of human confusions: "ideals, the lessons of past experience, greater knowledge, science, education, civilization—all the things of man and our contriving have failed, for all their immense value to man, to dam the destructiveness of man's inhumanity to man . . ., there is no possibility of any escape or recovery by man's unaided efforts," and "it is reasonable to expect a revelation of God." This doctrine of the reasonableness of a revelation is not unlike a modern restatement of the ancient prophetic proclamation of its certainty. On the other hand, Mr Greeves, who discusses in particular the mode of it, insists upon its original "strangeness," its "unfamiliarity and unexpectedness." The Bible does not persuade. It jolts. Facts, not arguments, are the contents of the Christian witness. Doctrine (he quotes Dr E. F. Scott) "concerns the mind and is easy"; the Gospel is "extremely hard." And, reflecting the differing treatment of their subject, there is a marked difference in style between the two studies: the one is smooth, measured, possessing an even flow throughout the argument; the other staccato, sometimes repetitive, anecdotal, abrupt.

Canon Balmforth's brevity is more noticeable, for his range is wider. His handling of scriptural motifs would have gained urgency from scriptural phrasing, and some readers might have been grateful for an explanation of his description of the incarnate Christ as "the Sacrament of Deity" (p. 88) and for a fuller reply to the modern (and by no means rare) objection that the phrase, "communion of the Body and Blood of Christ," is "strange and even gruesome" (p. 96). But that is to ask for more than space could permit. An Anglican can eagerly use both of these books: *The Christian Way* will awaken or renew his personal religion, and *The Christian Religion* will lead him farther along the Church's way.

W. W. S. March.

London.

The Third Day. By Arnold Lunn. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 10s. 6d.

Scientific Rationalism and Christian Faith. By R. E. D. Clark. Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 2s.

These books can suitably be reviewed together as examples of

Christian counter-offensive. Dr Clark's bears the sub-title "With particular reference to the writings of Prof. J. B. S. Haldane and Dr J. S. Huxley." Thinking the time has come to psychoanalyse the sceptics, he traces their intellectual development from the abundant data provided by their books. Both are victims of the "between-the-wars" frustration of scientists, who were trained in numbers beyond the power of the market to absorb and were inclined to be jealous of the ease with which the few theologians got jobs. Dr Clark has no difficulty in showing that Prof. Haldane's controversial methods are discourteous and by no means generally approved by fellow-scientists, and that he often deludes simple readers into thinking that speculations are scientific facts. "It is reasonable to conclude that the anti-religious attitude of a small section of well-known scientists owes its origin to emotional rather than factual causes." Altogether the book is outstanding as a courteous but hard-hitting piece of controversy.

Mr Lunn's book is on a larger scale. As readers of his earlier books may remember, he was brought to the faith by a realization that the Resurrection was true, which antedated any attempt to become a practising Christian. He now writes a most attractive book on the subject, obviously intended for the general reader. He begins with a diagnosis of the present state of morals, which is deplorable owing to the widespread abandonment of the faith. I am reminded of Guy Thorne's *When it was Dark*, a novel of some forty years ago, which described the discovery of evidence proving that the body of Jesus never rose from the dead; the result was an instantaneous collapse of morals, which was arrested when the author of the forgery confessed his crime. A well-known bishop preached a sermon on the book in his cathedral, which was considered ludicrous by most educated people. Events have proved that novelist and bishop were wrong only in supposing a sudden change in moral standards.

Mr Lunn begins with the miracles of Lourdes, which show the falsity of the generally accepted dogma that miracles do not happen; without such modern miracles he might be tempted to give a verdict of "not proven" on the Resurrection. (Later he recounts the non-Christian miracles of psychic phenomena and "extra-sensory phenomena.") He then briefly considers the Gospels, relying largely on Dr Salmon. "Either the Gospels are the work of eyewitnesses who truthfully recorded genuine miracles or they are works of fiction." All the details of the census of Luke ii have been proved to be right by discoveries in Egypt and by Ramsay's explorations in Asia Minor. The real difficulties which beset the student when he grapples with the Resurrection stories are not treated and the theology of the Resurrection is completely ignored. An orthodox theologian, who himself has no doubts of the Resurrection by which he directs his life, yet feels it necessary to be cautious and not claim too much. He doubts whether the Resurrection can ever be brought into the framework of history. So his treatment of the subject is marked by qualifications which mar the effectiveness of his apologia. Mr Lunn has no inhibitions and has also the gift of making the subject very interesting. Those who have failed to "put it across" to the modern mind will gratefully acknow-

ledge his help and trust that he will have the success which has not been their lot.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Chichester.

The Sunday Gospels. By J. H. Ward. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d.

The report of the Archbishops' Commission, *Towards the Conversion of England*, rightly emphasizes the need of Bible preaching—that is, "the unfolding of the great themes of the Bible, and their application to the lives of men" (p. 129). Those of us who on most Sundays preach on the Gospel for the day would find it a searching test to have our sermons for a year printed and tested by this standard. It might show how without realizing it we labour at a few points of the Gospel truth and neglect others. We might come off worse than Mr Ward does in his *Sunday Gospels*. These outlines nearly all have three clear points with many illuminating comments. If other preachers desire to use these sermon-notes, they would at least have to bring in their own illustrations and in places thin out the rhetorical questions. Perhaps many of us slip more often than Mr Ward does into the fault of tying our own ideas on to a Gospel text (and implicitly claiming Gospel authority for them), rather than attempting to preach the Gospel itself; but in his sermon on "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost," Mr Ward gives us a glaring example of this fault when he writes, "Most of us live infinitely below our resources. . . . One of the outstanding discoveries of modern psychology is the unconscious or subconscious mind. Most of us live as if we had only 'the five barley loaves and the two small fishes' of our consciousness to draw upon, . . . If this is true of mundane being it is profoundly truer of spiritual life. Here we have not only the subconscious to draw upon, but the superconscious" (pp. 37-38). But we are grateful for much in this small book, and not least for the timely quotation of Phillips Brooks's words on Bible preaching, "The Minister who keeps the word 'message' always written before him as he prepares his sermon in his study, or utters it from the pulpit, is saved from the tendency to wanton and wild speculation, and from the mere passion of originality. He who never forgets that word 'witness' is saved from the unreality of repeating by rote mere forms of statement, which he has learned as orthodox, but never as true" (p. 7).

S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E.

SHORTER NOTICES

If we can judge by the four specimens we have to review of this series (Modern Christian Revolutionaries, published at 4s. 6d. each by James Clarke and Co.) the writers have been very well chosen. Each seems to be a friend and disciple, who shares as well as describes the views of the great man; yet none of them are disciples of the irritating kind who lose their critical faculty in his presence.

First we have *Eric Gill: Workman*, by Donald Attwater. Gill, with his pacifism and medievalism, may be thought to have been a com-

panion of cranks. But he was no crank himself. Aquinas and his own healthy animal spirits kept him a realist even in his most idealistic moments. As a loyal Roman Catholic, he was from very loyalty critical of the excrescences and perversions that disfigure his Church, and not it only. When he visited the Holy Land, he was able to see "the sweating face of Christ" not just in spite of but in the dirt and backwardness and sectarian squabbles. In his own province too he was a revolutionary. "To hell with culture," he said. Competent workmanship which made motor-bodies and electric switchboards was art after its kind. So he did not model in clay a design to be copied by a professional carver in stone. He carved the stone himself, in the shapes and contours his material demanded. Mr Attwater's book is the best written of our bunch. Of course he doesn't criticize Gill. But who could?

The Wild Knight of Battersea: G. K. Chesterton is by F. A. Lea. G.K. was probably the first to convince the world that cleverness and humour were qualities possessed by the "Orthodox." Indeed his very brilliance makes him rather unreadable in large chunks, while infinitely refreshing in small doses. Mr Lea quotes Chesterton well, which is easy. He also criticizes him well—at once severely and affectionately—which is harder.

Nicol Macnicol writes on *C. F. Andrews: Friend of India.* Maybe readers of THEOLOGY may feel that their neo-orthodoxy should not allow them to sympathize much with this book. For them C. F. Andrews's devotional works have no bite. They do not share his nineteenth-century horror of the Athanasian Creed, but do feel a different sort of horror at his ceasing to exercise his Anglican orders and subsiding into lay communion, as well as at his practically equating Hinduism with Christianity. But, unlike us, C. F. Andrews was a revolutionary, not in his words but by his actions. His greatness consists in his noble lifelong protest against the colour bar. England ought to be proud of him. He is more worth while being proud of than her "Empire-builders." Mr Macnicol tells us of Andrews's self-sacrificing life and of his friendships, as well as of his not so interesting writings. He protests mildly against his lack of biblical "intolerance," and suggests that he expected too much from a reformed Hinduism because his friends, Gandhi and Tagore, adhere to a theistic type of religion that is entirely different from Vedantic Pantheism.

—In *Nicolas Berdyaev and the New Middle Ages* Dr Evgueny Lampert has produced what is by far the most profound of our four books. We have started to read it a second time. We were disappointed to find only a few meagre details about Berdyaev's life or personality. But Dr Lampert gives us a most competent summary of the chief points of his theology and anthropology. He does not like the doctrine of "Ungrund" taken over from Boehmen. Yet in *The Divine Realm* we read of "the meonic darkness of dawningl ife, the formless earth before the Word had shaped and kindled it" (p. 75). Perhaps the difference is that Berdyaev lets it escape from that place, before the "Mens agitat molem," and allows it to get a little out of control. As we might expect, Dr Lampert fires off a few small guns at Barth and

Aquinas, less impressive than the well-aimed broadsides he shot at them in *The Divine Realm*. Anglicanism, so Pauline and Augustinian in the sixteenth century, has been rather platonized in later times. Russian theology has gone in the opposite direction. It ought, with its Byzantine antecedents, to be so passionlessly Platonic and Patristic and Johannine. But the apocalyptic Russian soul has erupted within it, and we find among the lava, in Berdyaev and Dostoevsky at any rate, a good deal of Romans six and seven. So a little more cross-fertilization may help us.

Cosslett Quin.

Killinagh Rectory,
Co. Cavan.

The Twilight of Civilization. By Jacques Maritain. Translated by Lionel Landry. Sheed and Ward. 3s. 6d.

This book, consisting of four lectures delivered in Paris just before the war and now published with a few minor modifications, is to be recommended to anyone who wants a brief summary of the main theses of *True Humanism* and some indication of the way its author's thought has developed since that work was written. True humanism is, he asserts, theocentric, while that of the modern world has been anthropocentric; and the extreme rationalism with which the latter began has been succeeded by an irrationalist tidal wave. Racialism, supremely manifested in Nazism, is not atheism but a demonic and irrationalist paratheism; it is not a dogma for it denies the very notion of truth. Communistic atheism, on the other hand, is dogmatic; "it is an error asserting itself as truth." Thus, Maritain tells us, "a Nazi people . . . can only be cured of racial paganism by a crushing defeat of their undertakings of aggression; whereas it is possible for a Communist people to be cured of materialistic atheism by some internal transformation, however hard and difficult such a process may be" (pp. 21-2). But all is not well with democracy either: "the question now is whether the people of the countries which are still free are capable of attaining, by the paths of liberty and of the spirit, a sufficient moral unanimity, and whether they are capable of resisting the adulterations which threaten their very conscience from within. . . . The question is whether or not, in the face of an unprecedented loosing of pagan violence and of all the means which draw strength from the degradation of the human being, we understand the need of going back to the first source of spiritual energies; the need of the violence which bears away the kingdom of heaven, and which alone can elevate man's natural powers, for struggle and for suffering, to a level where they truly dominate history" (pp. 46-7).

E. L. Mascall.

Oxford.

The Persecution of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia. By the Right Rev. Bishop Dionisiye, Monastery of St Sava, Libertyville, Illinois. 1s.

Bishop Dionisiye sketches the history of the Serbian Orthodox Church and then gives a full account of its persecution which followed

the Nazis' entrance into Yugoslavia and the subsequent partition of the country in April, 1941. In particular the Bishop exposes the hardships suffered by the Orthodox Serbs at the hands of Roman Catholic Croats and the Moslems of Bosnia. A correspondent who is well informed about the Balkans agrees that pressure was put upon the Orthodox Serbs to submit to the Roman obedience in the so-called "Independent State of Croatia" and that some of the Roman Catholic clergy at least condoned the persecution; yet Bishop Dionisiye does not mention that Roman prelates did protest against the atrocities committed against the Serbs. Bishop Dionisiye also denounces the Macedonian movement within the Serbian Church, which aims at making the Macedonian dioceses self-governing. This movement seems to have the approval of Marshal Tito. There is, however, nothing here about Tito's régime itself, which, our correspondent says, plans a sweeping confiscation of the Church's landed estates and the abolition of religious teaching in schools.

This book is the statement of an advocate, but it serves to warn English Churchmen not to become so immersed in their domestic concerns as to forget the far greater problems facing their fellow-Christians on the Continent.

S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E.

People Matter. A broadcast series on the nature of justice. S.C.M. 6s.

These talks were broadcast in the spring of 1945 by a distinguished team of members of the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Free Churches, and the Roman Catholic Church. Their dating and synchronism are sometimes obscure (*e.g.*, Nos VII and XII would appear to have been spoken on the same Easter day (see pp. 97 and 172), contradicting the impression created by the order in which the addresses are printed), and this is muddling. But apart from this difficulty, it is no good my trying to make out that I enjoyed reading them. The style, suitable perhaps for broadcasting, is often intolerable for reading, and distracts attention from the thought. I finished the book only because I said I would write this notice. I did not hear the addresses. Probably many of those who did will be glad to have the text. But the printing of text composed for broadcasting is, I think, a chancy business, and it has not come off here.

H. C. L. Heywood.

Southwell.

The New Era : Lock Memorial Lectures, 1945. Charity Organisation Society. 1s.

These four lectures, promoted by the above society, survey the post-war era with reference to Religion, Youth, Education, and Citizenship. The first is a concise discourse by the Bishop of Sheffield, the salient points of which are: the impossibility of the maintenance of the Christian ethic without Christian doctrine; that man must realise, through worship, his "creatureliness"; the necessity for Christian forgiveness in relation to justice; and the place of the Church in post-

war planned society. The second lecture, on "Youth," by Wing-Commander Douglas-Hamilton—the sincerity of whose idealism need not be questioned—reflects a prevalent misconception. The function of the Church is merely to supply "principles," but physical jerks form the mainspring of character training! The vision of perfection can be achieved by human initiative. Divine grace apparently plays no part. The third, by Mr H. C. Dent, deals with education. Assuming the possibility of planned democracy, he gives a penetrating analysis of the various influences such as home, school, Church, cinema, radio, etc., to which the citizen of that democracy is inevitably subject. Fourthly, Miss Barbara Ward attributes the present lack of sense of responsibility in citizenship to the fact that modern industry makes for impersonal relationships, and that decisions involving the majority are generally made by the few. She ends with a plea for the revival of that religious conviction which inspired those who fought for democracy.

A Reply to Dr Freeman. By K. E. H. Parkinson. Warren and Son Ltd, Winchester. 1s.

This reply to a bad book is by a Winchester clergyman who is well justified in feeling that Dr Freeman has besmirched the proud name of Winchester. It is brief but to the point. Perhaps a little more might have been made of the fact that what Dr Freeman preaches may be a creed of his own, but it is not New Testament Christianity. It is to be hoped that this pamphlet will be widely circulated, for dangerous books such as *Christianity and Boys* still tend to be taken seriously by heads of schools whose knowledge of the Christian Faith is as scanty as that of Dr Freeman.

Christianity and the Modern Need—A Modernist Approach. The Modern Churchmen's Union and the Union of Modern Free Churchmen. 6d.

This pamphlet is typical of much of the "theology" of these two bodies. Authority and tradition go overboard—there is some vague talk of "spirit" and equally vague pantheism, doubtfully Christian and not noticeably modern.

M. S. Dawson.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.

CORRESPONDENCE

P. T. FORSYTH

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

In response to many requests, and as soon as conditions allow, I am hoping to arrange for the re-publication of one or more of the works of my father, P. T. Forsyth. As he wrote some twenty-five books and only one—*The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*—is in print, it

s not easy to select. If any of your readers are sufficiently interested o send me their suggestions on a post-card I should value their help ery greatly.

Yours faithfully,
JESSIE FORSYTH ANDREWS.

ROSE COTTAGE,
INGS LANGLEY, HERTS.
January 1, 1946.

THE PUNISHMENT OF WAR CRIMINALS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I think there must be many who like myself are grateful to Mr Montgomery Belgion for his cogent expression of a deep-seated epugnance (not confined, I think, to a few peculiar individuals) felt gainst the current trials of "war criminals." Modern cynicism, it is rue, gnaws away at all things, and not least at the notion of the genuine ecessity of law; and for this reason it is certainly the more important o insist upon the fundamental validity of positive law when this is in ccordance with the natural and divine law. But this validity will not e upheld, and it may be only further weakened, by the support and ncouragement of legal processes whose assumed legality is purely *ad hoc* nd without precedent. Mr Belgion has said all that needs to be said n this point.

A consideration I should like to add concerns the possible effect of uch trials on the citizen who aims at being a Christian citizen. One of ne most stabilizing influences in secular society is the Christian cknowledgment of the duty of obedience to "the powers that be": a uty which lays under its obligation all citizens (including those of Germany). This duty goes pretty far and pretty deep: it obliges the itizen of to-day, for instance, to take up arms (if that phrase will not be onsidered too anachronistic) in time of national necessity, and this neans participating in, and being instrumental in the commission of, ll the special horrors associated with modern methods of warfare. I o not see how on the score of inhumanity, bestiality, etc., any true and ertain line can be drawn between what is at present allowable by the Christian conscience and what is not, since there is in fact no standard f judgment existent in the modern world by which such a line can be rawn. The German "war criminals," therefore, cannot be judged on his score. Furthermore, the victorious nations, by having allowed hemselves to be guided in their methods of waging war only by onsiderations of expediency, and especially by having introduced a ew weapon which has struck terror into the hearts of even leader-riters in the popular press, seem to have surrendered any moral rinciple they might otherwise have possessed which would have istinguished them from their enemies. If they have no moral right to and in judgment, I do not see how they can have any legal right. The only body which might have such a right would be a genuinely nternational court of justice (including, that means, German represent-

atives too), which would have the power to investigate the pre-war and war-time activities of all the nations engaged in the recent struggle, victors and vanquished, with the purpose of summoning to trial any person of any nation who could be arraigned as a probable war criminal. The impossibility of such a proceeding is of course evident as soon as it is stated; and therefore it surely follows that, as any genuine assessment and exactment of retributive justice is not, in these days, practically possible, no course of pseudo-justice should be supported, above all by bodies calling themselves Christian, since such a course can only intensify modern "disillusionment," and assist in spreading the secular cynicism which is already so corrosive an influence in modern society.

Canon Hawkins maintains that all human justice is necessarily "imperfect": to use a blunter word, unjust. Is it possible that such an attitude can arouse any respect for justice and Christianity in hearts and minds already surrendered to scepticism? When justice is only dubiously to be attained, surely mercy is a fitter and more perfect fulfilment of God's will, especially when it may well be that the utter collapse of German militarism, and the gruesome and humiliating end of its loudest mouthpiece, are in themselves sufficient evidence of the retribution which overtakes a society raised in denial of the divine Will. For the German nation has suffered defeat. In the hour of defeat it was already judged. Its defeat is its judgment. God forbid that the victorious nations, by their behaviour in the hour of victory, should call down upon themselves a judgment equally severe and irrevocable.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE R. LAMB.

BEECHURST, DUXFORD, CAMBS.
December 11, 1945.

BAPTISM OF THE ILLEGITIMATE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I have become responsible for the spiritual welfare of a hostel for unmarried mothers with their babies, received direct from maternity homes, and to be cared for for six months or more. I understand that in similar homes elsewhere, and in maternity homes which have a chaplain (Church of England), it is customary to baptize the infants (when the mother is a baptized person) without any godparents, the mother alone undertaking the sponsorial duty.

Ought I to perform similar baptisms (which for my part I should do in the parish church where my hostel is situated)? And if not, what is my alternative duty?

Yours, etc.,

L. D. HEPPENSTALL,
Chaplain-General, Community of the Holy Name,
MALVERN LINK.

December 11, 1945.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher